

Colonel. This is the thing called patriotism.

"Hurrah for patriotism!" yelled a man, and the crowd hurrahed.

"The people who possess it," went on the speaker, "go about with a brass band to keep up their courage. [Chorus of 'Oh! oh! oh!'] These pinchbeck patriots call war an honorable thing. The author of this message, which has almost plunged us into war—the President of the United States—has very little personal appreciation of this honorable thing. A thousand pities it is that before he wrote that warlike message he did not consult his substitute and learn what war is. [Mingled hisses and cheers.] We say to Enhland, 'It's wrong for you to go to war with Venezuela, and, if you dare to do it, we will go to war with you.' ["We do," yelled a man, "and we'll lick her, too."] It reminds me of the Professor who, opposing capital punishment, said, 'Capital punishment is wicked. Anybody who favors it

To England—Response to a Sonnet of
William Watson's.

The towering Daughter thus salutes the Dame!

'Tis not the thousand leagues of neutral foam
Secures me, for when I had found a home
In sunset land, across the sea there came
A mother! sword in hand, with eyes aflame
And heart wrought full of bitterest intent
Against me, poor and suffering and spent,
Yet of a spirit she could never tame!
Oh, to come thus in hate, and go in shame!

But, stronger now, I sit beside the sea

Watching my younger sisters at their play.
My tasks are all of peace; but if to me
Cometh a cry along the ocean way,
Then will I smite the cruel, and befriend
The succorless, and put the false to shame!
So shall the world respect me, and my Fame
Be one of honor even to the end!

DEC. 25.

W. H. OSTRANDER.

reason with him further; if he does, argument is unnecessary.

The Monroe doctrine is a policy beyond dispute. But "opportunism" is not a policy; it is the negation of one. A policy is a system or settled method of conduct; opportunism is the practice of taking advantage of opportunities as they turn up, living politically, as vagabonds live individually, from hand to mouth. Is this seriously our distinguished Yale Professor's conception of the Monroe doctrine? Is this his notion of a policy?

So it would seem; for he endeavors to fortify the opinion by citing Mr. CALHOUN, who, he says, was "in a position to know what the Monroe declarations meant and to what they were applicable," and whom he represents approvingly as regarding the Monroe doctrine as "a policy only, to be followed or not as interest dictated." This citation has little or no value; but, as Mr. CALHOUN's remarks have been thought worthy of a foot note in LAWRENCE'S Wheaton, we will not pass them wholly by. Besides, the point may be said to have a shade of historical interest. As a member of President MONROE'S Cabinet, Mr. CALHOUN no doubt was "in a position to know," and at the time pretty certainly did know better than this. "I have understood from good authority," said Mr. WEBSTER, speaking of the Monroe doctrine a little more than two years after its enunciation, "that it was considered, weighed, and distinctly and decidedly approved by every one of the President's advisers at that time."

When Mr. CALHOUN, in 1848, undertook to recall his experiences of that time however, a quarter of a century had passed, and it may well have been that they came back to him imperfect, especially as his functions in the Cabinet, as the Secretary of War, did not bring him into close relation with the foreign policy of the Administration, and more especially as he had been for nearly the whole of the intervening period in unrelenting antagonism to the statesmen who more than all others were the sponsors and champions of the Monroe doctrine. His evidence is weakened by relative inferiority in the opportunities of knowing, by the lapse of time and by inveterate prejudice. Moreover, the gist of his evidence, as the outcome, no doubt, of this triple defect, embodies a self-contradiction. The member of President MONROE'S Cabinet who knew most about the Monroe doctrine, and who, if we may trust political tradition, countenanced by official usage, to say nothing of official duty, had more to do with formulating the doctrine than President MONROE himself, was the Secretary of State, JOHN QUINCY ADAMS of Massachusetts. He unquestionably could speak on the subject with authority. And he did speak, not merely by words, but by actions.

The next year after the declaration of the Monroe doctrine, Mr. ADAMS was chosen as Mr. MONROE'S successor in the Presidency, and one of the first acts of his Administration in relation to foreign nations, and perhaps the most signal act of his Administration in any relation, was to reassert the Monroe doctrine in the sense here ascribed to it, with the additional application of that doctrine to the purchase of Cuba from Spain by another European power, following it up by the appointment of Commissioners to the Panama congress, convoked expressly to promote, among other objects, the effectual operation of the doctrine in its length and breadth. In this action President ADAMS was zealously sustained throughout by CLAY in the Cabinet and by WEBSTER in the Senate, both of whom were "in a position to know" everything there was to know in the councils of President MONROE, and who told what they knew not to posterity only, but primarily to their immediate contemporaries. On the question as to the Monroe construction of the Monroe doctrine the contemporaneous and concurrent testimony of ADAMS, CLAY, and WEBSTER is decisive. As to the justness of that construction, the Monroe declarations speak for it and for themselves.

So much for the view of the Monroe doctrine taken from the chair of International Law at Yale. Contracted and self-contradictory as the view is, the occupant of the chair is constrained to admit that the Monroe doctrine, even thus narrowed and degraded, if in this condition it may be called a doctrine, applies literally to the Venezuelan question, though it does not, he strangely contends, apply in reality. The reasoning by which he supports this proposition, we must be pardoned for saying, is such as seldom emanates from a person of common sense. Quoting President CLEVELAND'S application of the Monroe doctrine to the question of the Venezuelan boundary, he remarks:

"The argument is perfectly clear and needs no elaboration. An unsettled boundary dispute between a British colony and Venezuela, a disposition to 'edge up' on the latter in the matter of territory, is an attempt to extend the European system to a sister republic and to control her destiny. On the face of it, this is a possible inference, but only by emphasizing the letter, not the spirit, and real intent, of MONROE'S message, and by almost a perversion of words. Apply the same language to our Maine boundary. The valley of the St. John was disputed ground. By the Ashburton compromise it was divided between the disputants. Is it a proper use of language to say that the success of Great Britain in acquiring the country north of the St. John River to the St. Lawrence watershed, which we had justly claimed, extends a European system to the United States or controls its destiny? Venezuela is a perfectly parallel case. Were we to lose the whole region in dispute by arbitration or by aggression, in neither case would a new system be extended over her, or her destiny be controlled."

In this case, if we may venture to face the appalling confusion of thought it presents, the territory lost by arbitration or by compromise would be no longer in dispute, but the acknowledged territory of Great Britain which, of course, in taking possession of her own would not extend her system to Venezuela or any part of Venezuela; but the territory lost by aggression would be territory still claimed by Venezuela and wrested from her by Great Britain, which, accordingly, would extend her system to so much of Venezuela as she had seized, thereby directly controlling the destiny of this part and indirectly the destiny of the whole. The case of Venezuela, so far from being parallel to that of Maine, is rather at right angles to it. In the case of Maine, as produced by our Professor, Great Britain did no more than occupy the territory ceded to her by treaty; in the case of Venezuela, on the contrary, Great Britain occupies the territory in dispute, refuses to submit her claim to arbitration, and squares off in its defence against the victim she has despoiled. The distinction between the two cases involves the venerable distinction of *meum et tuum*. In the one case Great Britain observed this distinction; in the other she tramples on it. Our Professor, we hope, will at least recognize it without the necessity of a formal exposition. He asks innocently if it is a proper use of language to say that Great Britain, in taking possession of the territory ceded to her by the treaty of Washington, extended her system to any portion of the United States? We have no hesitation in saying that it is not; it is a piece of stupidity as asinine as it would be to say that Great Britain would not have extended her sys-

tem to any portion of the United States had she seized the valley of the St. John, rejected arbitration, scorned concession, and maintained her seizure by force and arms.

We now come to what this international lawyer calls "the vital point of the whole matter." He shall present it himself:

"We may grant, though contrary to fact, that the Monroe doctrine is applicable to the Venezuelan boundary dispute. Proof must still be furnished that a failure to enforce it would endanger our peace and safety. If they are not so endangered, we have no ground for interference. The Monroe doctrine declares this. President CLEVELAND implies it. The commentators who have been quoted say it. Does British control over the wild frontier region in dispute between Venezuela and Guiana really threaten the safety of the United States? If so, why and how? We are entitled to specifications. For, unless the danger can be shown, an interference is unwarranted. Does Canada put our institutions in jeopardy? Does British Columbia imperil our form of government? If not, why does the danger lurk in distant Guiana? England has no constitutional form of government as our own. She is a good colonizer. Are such developments inimical to our safety?"

This he esteems his crowning argument. It is an argument, we scarcely need point out, not against the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine in the Venezuelan case, as he supposes, but against the Monroe doctrine as a doctrine; not against the enforcement of the doctrine in any special case, but against the doctrine itself. The argument, if sound, abolishes the Monroe doctrine by reducing it to opportunism, which we have seen is no doctrine at all, and no policy, but the opposite of both. He reasons from the standpoint of the abstract right of self-defence, which he mistakes for the Monroe doctrine, instead of from the application of that right which constitutes the doctrine; for the Monroe doctrine is nothing except a fixed and definite application of the right of self-defence against the extension of European dominion in America. The Monroe doctrine consists in this application and of it; it is nothing more, nothing less. The expediency of thus applying the right of self-defence is settled. It is not an open question. It was closed three-quarters of a century ago, when the people of the United States ratified by acclamation the doctrine of which this application is the alpha and omega.

What we of the present day have to do, therefore, when a particular extension of European dominion in this hemisphere comes in view, is to decide whether or not it is what it seems, and if it is, to resist it; to ascertain definitely whether the Monroe doctrine applies or not, and if it does, to apply it. We have not to decide anew, with every new case, whether or not the Monroe doctrine, if violated, shall be enforced, whether the extension of European dominion in America shall be resisted or not; whether resistance to the extension of European dominion in America is a proper or an improper exercise of the international right of self-defence. That was decided once for all by our fathers, whose decision we have made our own by approving the Monroe doctrine. It is our concern to execute the Monroe doctrine; not to institute it, not to reconstruct it, not to revoke it, and above all not to subvert it by resolving it back into the natural right from which it is derived, leaving behind no formulated word to warn others or to guide ourselves.

As for the mere insignificance or alleged insignificance of the territory in dispute, the obvious answer is conclusive. The territory, in point of fact, is larger than New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania together; but if it were one hundred thousand square miles, as British authority reports it to be, we could not with safety or honor submit to its wrongful seizure by a European power, even though it be, what our Professor naively assures us that Great Britain is, "a good colonizer." By the way, "good colonizer" is good. Resenting wrongs to pass a wrong is like stopping leaks. The leak neglected may presently become a breach that no hand can close. A nation that submits to a little wrong, will soon have a great one to resist. Resist beginnings. This is statesmanship. This is patriotism. This is wisdom. This is honor. This is safety.

Our Professor's "vital point," it turns out, is as void of vitality as a doornail. His crowning argument is not less fallacious than the arguments it crowns. Like every one of these, it is an egregious fallacy, not to say a glaring contradiction. It is precisely as if he had granted the applicability of a law, and then argued against the enforcement of the law by disputing its policy and denying its enactment.

However, having guarded against misconception, as we trust, by making this point thrice clear, we have no objection to step down from the Monroe doctrine for the nonce and step back with him to the considerations which brought about the doctrine in its application to the extension of European dominion in this hemisphere by colonization, the application which, to superficial minds, whose cosmopolitanism is at least as strong as their patriotism, may seem the most arbitrary. We shall find those considerations briefly stated in President ADAMS'S special message of March 15, 1823, from which we extract this passage:

"The late President of the United States, in his message to Congress of the second of December, 1823, while announcing the negotiation then pending with Russia, relating to the northwest coast of this continent, observes that the occasion of the discussion is, which that incident had given rise had been taken for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States were involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they had assumed and maintained, were thenceforward not to be considered subjects for colonization by any European power. The principle had first been assumed in that negotiation with Russia. It rested upon a course of reasoning equally simple and conclusive. With the exception of the existing European colonies, which it was in no wise intended to disturb, the two continents consisted of several sovereign and independent nations, whose territories covered their whole surface. By this their independent condition the United States enjoyed the right of commercial intercourse with every part of their possessions. To attempt the establishment of a colony in those possessions would be to usurp, to the exclusion of others, a commercial intercourse which was the common possession of all. It could not be done without encroaching upon existing rights of the United States."

These considerations, of course, apply also to the Monroe doctrine in its other applications, reinforced in some of them by manifest considerations of national security, as mentioned by President MONROE, which the shallowest cosmopolitan could not refuse to acknowledge, and would hardly hold cheap. In short, the doctrine is called for by our "peace and safety" as well as by our "rights and interests," a disregard for either of which would endanger both. But enough. Our Professor, in his Quixotic tilt at the Monroe doctrine, calls for "specifications." Under protest, and *ex grætia*, we submit them. His demand for them is illogical, and so, perhaps, is our compliance, but, if one may judge from his arguments in the *Forum*, he will not think the worse of it on that account.

By way of postscript to this article, and as a matter of historical significance, we invite attention to President ADAMS'S remark in the above-quoted passage that "the principle had first been assumed in that negotiation with Russia." That negotiation with Russia had been conducted by Mr. ADAMS, as President MONROE'S Secretary of State, so that the remark is all but tantamount to

avowing the authorship of the Monroe doctrine. For our own part, we have little doubt that he was in fact the author. Be this as it may, Mr. CANNING'S suggestion to Mr. RUSH concerning the Allied Powers, Mr. RUSH'S report of it to his Government, and President MONROE'S incorporation of it into his message, were merely steps in a particular application of the principle, although the emergency which called forth this application and the world-wide interest which the application excited, have served not only to push into the background the application of the principle to European colonization in this hemisphere, but to overshadow the principle itself. But it is chiefly the expositors and professors of international law who have failed to penetrate the shadow. The country at large and the world at large have never lost sight of the principle. The mass of civilized mankind from the first have understood perfectly that the Monroe doctrine is simply resistance to the extension of European dominion in America. It is the academic world that has lacked the gumption to grasp this fact. "These he thy gods, O Israel." In our opinion it is time these hind leaders of those who see were turned down.

The Monroe Doctrine on Trial at New Haven.

The esteemed contemporary who occupies the chair of international law at Yale University has given to the public, in the February number of the *Forum*, his opinion of the Monroe doctrine and of President CLEVELAND'S application of it to the British encroachment in Venezuela. Inverting the rational order of these questions, however, he tells us what he thinks of the President's application of the doctrine before he tells us what he thinks the doctrine is. In this inversion we prefer not to follow him. We notice his deliverance at all only because it offers a favorable occasion to isolate the principle of the Monroe doctrine. The commentators have got it badly mixed. Everybody understands the Monroe doctrine till he attempts to explain it to somebody else; then nobody understands it. The comment, and not the text, confounds us. The public as to this matter is very much in the situation of the old lady reading BUNYAN'S Pilgrim's Progress with SCOTT'S Explanatory Notes. She said she understood everything but the explanations.

Among the declarations of President MONROE, in his annual message of Dec. 2, 1823, which announced what is known as the Monroe doctrine, the first in order and the most general in form is this:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

The full meaning of this fundamental declaration is so plain that he may run who reads it. If the rights and interests of the United States require that the American continents shall not be considered as subjects for colonization by any European power, they require that those continents shall not be considered as subjects for the acquisition of territory or dominion by a European power in any other peaceable mode, much more by force; for it would be absurd to hold that our rights and interests in this respect are menaced by colonization, and not by cession or by conquest. The declaration asserts, then, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that no European power, by any means, whether by colonization, by cession, by conquest, by intrigue, or by artifice, shall extend its dominion in this hemisphere. This is the principle of the Monroe doctrine. The declarations respecting the South American States in the same message simply deal with an application of this principle to the threatened intervention of the Allied Powers, though incidentally reasserting the principle in its utmost extent, in affirming that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." The principle is thus outlined in each of its original applications.

It surely is unnecessary to emphasize the distinction between a principle and the application of a principle. Yet at this point we may exasperatingly dwell on it for a moment. Mr. MONROE'S declarations not only assert a principle but specify two applications of it, both typical. The principle, as we have seen, is that the rights and interests of the United States forbid the extension of European dominion in this hemisphere. This principle is applied specifically, first, to European colonization, typical of peaceable extension, and, secondly, to European intervention, typical of forcible extension. Neither of those cases under the Monroe doctrine is at present formidable; but the Monroe doctrine, nevertheless, remains in undiminished force, ready to be applied to either of them, or to any other case that may arise under it. Cases may come and cases may go, but the principle abides.

Such is the plain import of the famous declarations which set forth the Monroe doctrine. Such is the Monroe doctrine in its logical simplicity.

Not so, thinks our Professor. Referring to President MONROE, in connection with the scheme of the Allied Powers, he says:

"He announced a policy. That policy forbade the substitution of monarchies for republican forms of government on this continent by European force. . . . It did not forbid any step which the republics themselves chose to take, but simply what was forced upon them. It was the policy which fitted the hour and the occasion. It was opportunism."

This is to confound the Monroe doctrine with one of its applications. If the learned Professor, in view of the foregoing exposition, does not appreciate the blunder he has committed, it would be useless to

Nicaragua so as to get control of the point where the canal must find its outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. The United States protested, and strained relations between the two countries followed. The President sent a commissioner to ascertain the facts, and in so doing followed the example of President Monroe who, before recognizing the South American republics, sent commissioners to South America to learn the true condition of the contest between Spain and her revolted colonists. The difficulty with England was supposed to have been settled by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; but no sooner was it signed than England gave the clause especially affecting herself an interpretation exactly contrary to that understood by our Government, and we found we had gained but little in return for most important concessions.

The latest case to which the Monroe Doctrine has been applied is still in an early stage. In proposing the appointment of commissioners to find out the facts in the Venezuelan difficulty, President Cleveland has followed the precedents furnished by Monroe and Polk. If the facts support the present general belief in this country that England has been robbing an American republic of its territory, the United States is but following its usual practice in interfering; nor does such interference imply that the United States must assume responsibility for actions of the Southern republics, which get them into trouble with European powers. Our Government has more than once stated in the most explicit terms that we do not propose to screen those republics from the natural consequences of their own misdeeds. European Governments are entirely at liberty to compel them to meet their obligations. What we object to is the dismemberment of a republic as a result of, or under cover of, a course which may be legitimate enough up to a certain point. This, Secretary Cass wrote, in 1860, that while our policy

"denies the right of any power to hold permanent possession of any part of that country [Mexico], or endeavor by force to direct or control its political destiny, it does not call in question its right to carry on hostile operations against that republic for the redress of any real grievances it may have suffered. But we insist that such hostilities be fairly prosecuted for that purpose, and be not converted into the means of acquisition, or of political contract."

In 1866 Secretary Seward and again in 1870 Secretary Fish wrote to the same effect. Our policy in this particular is also that of European nations. England compelled Russia to withdraw from the immediate neighborhood of Constantinople at the close of the war with Turkey in 1879, and Russia obliged Japan to give up her intention of retaining the Loo-tung peninsula at the close of the war with China last year.

That an interference should carry with it the possibility of war is inevitable if our protest is to have any weight. It was so in 1823 when the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated. Adams writes in his account of the Cabinet meetings where the matter was discussed:

"Mr. Wirt remarked upon the danger of assuming the attitude of menace without meaning to strike, and asked if the Holy Alliance *should* act in direct hostility against South America, whether this country would oppose them by war. My paper and the paragraph would certainly commit us as far as the Executive constitutionally could act on this point."

Our experience with France well illustrates the difference between a protest which has not and one which has behind it the ability and intention to use force.

Our present disagreement with England is likely to test the Monroe Doctrine more severely than ever before. The immediate cause of the trouble appears trifling, tho it is, of course, trite to say that the gravity of a crisis depends upon what it leads to in the future. The tax on tea was a small matter in itself. But how is it in the present instance? When the Monroe Doctrine was formulated in 1823 it was invoked for our protection, every other consideration being subordinate to our own safety. If the European powers had helped Spain to recover her provinces, they would, of course, have claimed their reward; and it was believed that France would take Mexico, and Russia would take California. We would then have had powerful and ambitious European States at our very doors. Even if we were not directly attacked, the constant necessity of preparing to defend ourselves against possible attacks would surely have changed us into a military nation, an evil hardly less to be dreaded. The danger to ourselves was then real and pressing. But is it now? England's Government is as truly Republican as our own. If she were to seize the whole of Venezuela, our own Government and our security as a nation would not be endangered.

Nor does it seem probable that even such an extreme act of aggression would open the way to similar conquests by other European nations. The much stronger probability is that England would join hands with us to prevent it, as she was ready to do in 1823; and it is worth remembering that the success of our policy at that time was due largely to England's support. But the act supposed would be the overthrow of a sister republic, and the approach to it, which has apparently been made already, is an extension of European territory and political power in the New World. Against that the United States has set its face in the past with increasing firmness. Through a long series of State papers by Presi-

dents and Secretaries of State, along with the determination to protect ourselves, there is an evident intention to conserve and strengthen independent republican institutions in the regions south of us by confining European political establishments within narrow limits, and looking forward to their ultimate disappearance. As Secretary Fish said in 1870, our policy

"opposes the creation of European dominion on American soil, or its transfer to other European powers, and it looks hopefully to the time when, by voluntary departure of European governments from this continent and the adjacent islands, America shall be wholly America."

This catches the spirit of Jefferson's outline of our destined policy in American Affairs. We have not yet reached the point of never suffering Europe to inter-meddle with cisatlantic affairs; but are we not approaching it? Our present attitude toward England is an assertion of our primacy in both Americas. We cannot delude ourselves with the belief that our national integrity or the form of our Government are in any danger from England. But we do know that England contests our leadership outside of our own borders whenever it interferes with her own plans, and just there some trial of strength between the two nations in the near future seems probable. This does not mean that war is probable, tho it certainly is possible. There are not wanting indications that the United States is now ready and willing to take a more decisive part than formerly in the councils of the nations. The hand taken by our Government in the settlement of the Samoan difficulty a few years ago is a case in point.

When we think of the latent power of the United States, and the strength of our national spirit now united by the disappearance of slavery, it seems incredible that we can always be content to sit still and grow rich, taking little or no part in the stirring events of the world about us. Our traditional policy of non-interference in the affairs of the Old World, formulated by Washington and strengthened by our own convictions, is not likely to change. But Jefferson and Monroe pointed out the policy which is the natural companion to that of Washington. While non-participation in European affairs conserves our energies, leadership in American affairs furnishes a legitimate field for their exercise. Why should England, of all nations, try to crowd us out? It is lamentable to think of either part of the English-speaking world trying to diminish the prestige of the other.

It is most earnestly to be hoped that, without the loss of a drop of blood, the outcome of the present difficulty with England will be an amicable division of "the sphere of influence" between the two nations—we taking the Americas and England the rest of the world. In some such way as this, and probably in no other, can England and the United States exert their fullest and best influence in favor of civilization and popular government.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

the recent action was taken on President Cleveland's message. But neither was Washington's advice to keep clear of foreign alliances ever put in the form of law; yet it has none the less had a controlling influence greater than that of many laws. So with the Monroe Doctrine. It was at once accepted by our people with enthusiasm as the announcement of a policy to be pursued hereafter by the United States in relation to American affairs. Washington's maxim had already been adopted in the same way as relating to European affairs, and the two together outlined a foreign policy for the United States. This was clearly stated by Jefferson whom President Monroe consulted before sending his message to Congress.

Jefferson said:

"The question presented by the letter you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of Independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark upon it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs."

That is the keynote of the Monroe Doctrine, and accounts for the deep and lasting impression it has made upon our people. *It is our call to leadership in American affairs in the direction of complete political independence of Europe.*

The policy thus given in outline has been frequently expounded and applied. The first occasion for explanation came in connection with the Panama Congress. The South American republics naturally understood Monroe's words as promising aid for the future, and they hoped that the United States would enter into an alliance with them. President Adams and the House of Representatives both took pains to moderate their expectations. Monroe's warning to the Allied Powers had been heeded, and neither the United States nor the lesser republics were in any immediate danger, so there was a disposition in this country to halt and wait further developments. The resolution passed by the House has sometimes been represented as a repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine, but such was not the case. It merely declared that the United States would not unite with the other republics in any "alliance" or "joint declaration" or "compact" to support it at that time, but would remain free to take such a course in the future as might be called for when an actual emergency arose.

In the way of actual application of our policy, our history furnishes some notable examples of opposition to the forcible introduction, or even the peaceable strengthening of European power in the New World.

The best-known instance was the vigorous protest, both by the Executive and the House of Representatives, against the French attempt to set up an empire in Mexico. Our protests produced only irritation in France as long as we were not in a position to punish disregard of our wishes; but when the Civil War closed they were renewed and were backed by a movement of troops under Sheridan toward the Mexican border. It was believed that we were ready to fight, and the empire fell. About the same time Spain attacked Peru and Chile, apparently with the hope of regaining some of her lost possessions in America. The Monroe Doctrine was invoked, our Government interposed, and peace was restored. So, also, in San Domingo the Spaniards made a half-hearted attempt to recover lost ground but withdrew after receiving a remonstrance from our Government. About the same time, *i. e.*, in 1867, the "Dominion of Canada" was organized, and the House of Representatives passed a resolution expressing "extreme solicitude" at the erection on our border of a confederation "founded upon monarchical principles." This was an extreme assertion of the Monroe Doctrine which, from the nature of the case, could not change the course of events.

More to the point are the objections which have been made at various times to the peaceable transfer of American territory from a weak to a strong European Government. Indeed, our Government has, during the present century, generally objected to the acquisition of territory in the New World by any strong European power.

The first notable case occurred at the beginning of this century when it was discovered that France, by secret treaty with Spain, had acquired Louisiana. Jefferson immediately took alarm, and declared that the possession of that region by a strong power like France was a menace to the United States.

Another objection was made in a somewhat similar case in 1825, when it was believed that France was about to purchase Cuba from Spain. President Adams notified the French Government that "we could not consent to the occupation of these islands [Cuba and Porto Rico] by any other European power than Spain under any contingency whatever."

It is a fact of interest now, and somewhat ominous withal, that our first serious difficulty in applying our American policy, and the one which led to the least satisfactory result, was one with England in 1843. It was then supposed that the projected Nicaragua canal would soon be commenced. Accordingly, England assumed a protectorate over the Mosquito coast of

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

BY CHARLES H. SMITH, LL.D.,
PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN HISTORY IN YALE UNIVERSITY.

The statement of the Monroe Doctrine in the President's Message of December 2d, 1823, contains essentially three clauses. One in which he laid it down as a "principle" that "the American continents . . . are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." Another in which he stated twice in the most emphatic terms that the establishment of monarchical government by force in any part of America would be "dangerous" to the United States. A third in which he said that if "any European power" interfered with the Spanish American republics "for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny," the act would be considered as showing "an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

The first was directed primarily against a recent attempt of Russia to get control of some territory claimed by the United States in the Northwest; but it was intentionally stated so broadly as to include all the regions south of us. This clause has been quoted probably more frequently than any other by our Presidents and Secretaries of State, as the working clause of the Monroe Doctrine. The second was a distinct threat, the importance of which was shown by its repetition, directed against the Allied Powers to prevent them from helping Spain to recover her lost provinces in America. The third was essentially a part of the second, and was added, as Calhoun explained to the Senate in 1818, "to countenance and encourage these young republics as far as we could with propriety."

All these utterances of the President were called forth by existing emergencies; but it was well understood that they were not confined to them in their application. Altho stating the views of a single Administration, it was expected that the policy outlined would be adopted by succeeding Administrations, and such has been the case. This policy has never been embodied in the form of statute law, and indeed has never received the countenance of both Houses of Congress by formal vote until

view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

This concurrent action on the part of the United States and England shattered the plans of the Holy Alliance with reference to Spanish America. The concurrent declarations of the United States and England, the two great maritime powers of the world, constituted a guaranty of peace.

In January, 1824, a joint resolution was offered in the House of Representatives, by which it was declared that the people of the United States "would not see without serious inquietude, any forcible intervention by the allied powers of Europe, in behalf of Spain" to reduce her colonies to subjection. This resolution was never called up, and the House subsequently adopted a resolution adverse to the formation of any alliances or the making of any joint declaration which might hamper the freedom of the Government to take, on any future occasion, such an action as its interests might dictate. Mr. Webster, who enthusiastically supported the declaration of President Monroe in the sense in which it was understood at the time, declared in 1825, that the "amount" of President Monroe's declaration was

"that this Government could not look with indifference on any combination to assist Spain in her war against the South American States; that we could not but consider any such combination as dangerous or unfriendly to us, and that if it should be formed, it would be for the competent authorities of this Government to decide, when the case arose, what course our duty and interest should require us to pursue."

In another part of President Monroe's Message, there is a passage which is also treated as forming part of his doctrine. This passage occurs in a paragraph of the message, relating to controversies between the United States and Russia, as to their respective rights and interests on the northwest coast of America. On this subject, President Monroe said:

"In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent conditions which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Many diverse views have been expressed as to what was meant by the words "future colonization"; but it is not difficult to ascertain what they meant in the message of President Monroe. The term "colonization" has a definite meaning, namely, the settlement by immigrants of a region not under the control of any civilized power, unless that of the parent country. It is in this sense that the term was used in President Monroe's Message. The claim of the Russian Government to possess the northwest coast of America, from Bering Straits down to the fifty-first parallel of north latitude, involved the title to territory which was claimed by the United States as well as by Great Britain. The United States denied the Russian claim on the ground that Russia had no "settlement" in the disputed territory. In his instructions to our Minister to Russia, John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, said:

"Occupied by civilized nations they [the American continents] will be accessible to Europe and each other on that footing alone."

In 1825 Mr. Adams, who had then become President, in a message on the Panama Congress, suggested, among other things, the following topic of discussion:

"An agreement among all the parties represented at the meeting that each will guard, by its own means, against the establishment of any European colony within its borders. . . . This was more than two years since announced by my predecessor to the world as a principle resulting from the emancipation of both the American continents."

As Mr. Adams drew the passage on future colonization in President Monroe's Message, it is to be assumed that he knew what it meant; and no one, I believe, suggested at the time that he was in error as to what he said. We doubtless had an interest, as Mr. Webster said, in inducing Mexico and other American Governments to "settle it, as a part of their policy, not to allow colonization within their respective territories." It is obvious, however, that there was no thought on the part of the United States of dictating to the Spanish American Governments the course they should pursue. Indeed, Mr. Adams, discussing this subject in his Diary, says:

"Considering the South Americans as independent nations, they themselves, and no other nation, had the right to dispose of their condition. We have no right to dispose of them, either alone or in conjunction with other nations. Neither have any other nations the right of disposing of them without their consent."

In 1848, however, the Monroe Doctrine came up in a new form, which should be called the Polk Doctrine rather than the Monroe Doctrine. An Indian outbreak having occurred in Yucatan, the authorities offered to transfer the "dominion and sovereignty" to the United States, and at the same time made a similar offer to Great Britain and Spain. President Polk recommended the occupation of the territory by the United States, and in so doing declared that "we could not consent to a transfer of this 'dominion and sovereignty' to either Spain, Great Britain or any other European power." This pronouncement went far beyond the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine was, as we have seen, based upon the rights of American States, whose independence we had acknowledged, to dispose of themselves as they saw fit. The Polk Doctrine, on the other hand, would forbid the acquisition of dominion by a European power even by voluntary transfer or cession; and in this relation it is to be observed that President Polk, in defining his doctrine, limits it to North America, declaring that

"it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no European colony or dominion shall, with our con-

sent, be planted or established in any part of the North American Continent."

From the foregoing review, we may draw the following conclusions: 1. That the so-called Monroe Doctrine was a measure of defense, not of aggression.

2. That it was directed against a threatened intervention by a combination of European powers for the purpose of reducing independent American States to subjection to a European power. We told them that we should consider "any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." What was their "system"? In its internal manifestation, it meant the maintenance of an absolute and despotic Government, denying liberty and representation to the citizen, suppressing freedom of speech and of the press, and treating even the advocacy of liberal ideas as a crime; in its external manifestation it meant intervention such as took place in Piedmont, Naples and Spain, for the purpose of putting down constitutional governments and setting up absolute and despotic governments in their place. It was not possible for our Government to contemplate with indifference the establishment of such Governments, in a spirit of aggression, from the northern borders of California and Mexico to Cape Horn. The intervention we proposed was intervention against intervention.

3. That while, in the course we took, we acted with a regard to our own peace and safety, we did not assume to dictate to other American States the course they should pursue.

4. That, in our declaration in regard to future colonization, we had in mind primarily our own territorial dispute with Russia, though we announced the principle in general terms, intending to recommend it to other independent American States, as a part of their policy, not to allow the establishment of new European colonies within their own limits.

In the light of what has been said, it is superfluous to say that there is nothing in the Monroe Doctrine to warrant the idea that we are somehow committed to a kind of protectorate over the independent States of this hemisphere, in consequence of which we are required to espouse their quarrels, nor we cannot control their conduct. To state such a proposition is to refute it. We should, indeed, always be ready to extend the good offices of friendship in every proper case. But the idea that our position is that of an involuntary military force, at the beck and call of any American State that may stand in need of it; that we are to supply their deficiencies in men and in money, in order that they may conduct their controversies with European powers on a basis of equality in force and resources, is an idea that must be repugnant to the sense of every reflecting man.

The Monroe Doctrine was correctly asserted by the United States in the case of the French intervention by Mexico. In an instruction to our Minister to France, of June 21st, 1862, Mr. Seward said:

"France has a right to make war against Mexico, and to determine for herself the cause. We have a right and interest to insist that France shall not improve the war she makes to raise up in Mexico an anti-Republican or anti-American Government, or to maintain such a government there. France has disclaimed such designs, and we, besides reposing faith in the assurances given in a frank, honorable manner, would, in any case, be bound to wait for, and not anticipate, a violation of them."

Subsequently, when it became apparent that France sought to subjugate Mexico, we did not hesitate to declare our position, and in 1860 we notified the Austrian Government that, if it sent any troops to the support of Maximilian, we could not engage longer to remain neutral in the contest. Our position, doubtless, would have been the same if the Monroe Doctrine had never been announced. Our position rested upon the principle of opposition to manifest and dangerous aggression, a principle which may be assumed always to exist in every nation without regard to the question whether it has ever been expressly formulated.

Since the foregoing part of this paper was written, the President has sent his message to Congress on the Venezuelan boundary question. After the exposition which I have given of the Monroe Doctrine, it is unnecessary to point out the vast difference between the case presented to-day and that presented in 1823, when with England we protested against any attempt on the part of the allied powers to extend their system of despotism and intervention to this hemisphere.

MERITS OF THE VENEZUELAN CASE.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM L. SCRUGGS,
FORMERLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO VENEZUELA.

EARLY in the first quarter of the present century, a dispute arose between British Guiana and Venezuela over the ownership of a narrow strip of territory on the Atlantic coast between the mouths of the Essequibo and the Pomarion Rivers. England had already seized and occupied portions of this territory, which she claimed as part of the three Dutch "settlements of Demarara, Barbice and Esse-qui-bo," that had been ceded to her by Holland in the treaty of 1814; and Venezuela claimed it as an integral part of her domain inherited from Spain in 1810. The extreme limit of Venezuela's claim, then as now, was to the Essequibo River, which she considered the ancient boundary line between Holland and Spain. The extreme limit of England's claim was then to the Pomarion, which she considered the ancient boundary; but she subsequently extended her claim, first to the Morocco, then to the Guiana, then to the Orinoco Delta, and now indefinitely southward, so as to include the rich gold fields of the Cuyuni and the whole of the eastern watershed of the Orinoco Valley.

The question naturally arises, How came the British claim to be thus indefinitely extended, while that of Venezuela remained fixed and definite? The answer to this question reveals the "true inwardness" of the present controversy concerning the merits of which THE INDEPENDENT asks me to say a few words.

In the year 1840, the German engineer, Robert Schomburgk, then in the service of the British Government, marked out the line which bears his name. This was done without the knowledge or concurrence of Venezuela; and as it allotted in British Guiana a vast area of Venezuelan territory not hitherto in dispute, the Government of the Republic vigorously protested, and insisted upon the immediate obliteration of that line as a condition precedent to negotiations looking to some conventional boundary. The result was that within less than eighteen months after the line had been run, the British Government distinctly disclaimed the "Schomburgk line," and ordered its obliteration by the Demarara authorities.

In the negotiations which followed, Lord Aberdeen, then at the head of the British Foreign Office, proposed a conventional boundary line beginning on the coast a few miles west of the Morocco River, and extending inland so as to include nearly or quite all the territory embraced within the extended British claim. His proposition was likewise coupled with the conditions that Venezuela should obligate herself not to alienate any remaining portion of her domain to a third power, and to treat the Indian occupants humanely. But even this proposal, however disadvantageous to Venezuela, might have been accepted had not Lord Aberdeen refused to make the conditions mutual. As it was, the proposition had to be rejected. The final outcome was the "Diplomatic Agreement" of 1850, whereby each of the parties obligated itself to the other not to occupy any portion of the then unoccupied territory in dispute till some definite settlement of the question of boundary could be reached.

How was that agreement kept? As usual in such cases, each party very soon began to accuse the other of bad faith. Venezuela insisted that the compact was first violated by British encroachments beyond even the proposed "Aberdeen line"; and England insisted that the compact had been violated by certain mining concessions made by Venezuela to a syndicate of capitalists. Venezuela had all along insisted upon a reference of the whole question of boundary to friendly arbitration; and Great Britain had as persistently refused to submit her claim to arbitration.

However, in May, 1855, Lord Granville, then Chief Secretary for Foreign Affairs, finally agreed to unite the boundary dispute with the controversies growing out of the thirty per cent. duty on imports from the British Antilles and certain indemnity claims by British subjects against Venezuelans, and to refer the whole to arbitration. But in July of the same year, Lord Salisbury, as the successor of Granville, flatly refused to carry out this written agreement of his immediate predecessor.

Subsequently, the Demarara authorities took forcible possession of the whole of the territory within the old "Schomburgk line," which had been so explicitly disclaimed and ordered to be removed by Lord Aberdeen. Not only this, but the old line had been so extended as to include some seventy square miles of additional territory, not hitherto in dispute, in which some of the richest gold mines on the continent had been discovered. British fortifications and police stations were established at Barima Point, the Amacura mouth, and along the left banks of the Cuyuni, and posts, flags and notices set up that the whole was under British jurisdiction. Thoroughly alarmed, Venezuela demanded the immediate evacuation of these posts and the restoration of the *status quo* of 1850 with a view to a submission of the whole question to impartial arbitration. The demand was not complied with, and the proposal for arbitration was received with haughty indifference. The result was the rupture of February, 1857, since which time all diplomatic relations between the two countries have remained suspended.

Since then, realizing her inability to regain her territory by force of arms, Venezuela has been persistent in her efforts through the mediation of friendly powers, to re-establish the *status quo* of 1850, and to have the whole dispute referred to friendly and impartial arbitration. This England has refused to entertain. She refuses to recognize any *status quo* except that existing in July, 1853, and will consent to arbitration "only under certain limitations." Those limitations are, that arbitration shall apply only to territory outside of the enlarged "Schomburgk line," her title to all within that line being too well established, and, therefore, too sacred, to be submitted to arbitration. In other words, she insists that the validity of her claim in virtue of her *de facto* occupancy, however wrongful in its inception, be conceded as a condition precedent to the arbitration of the question whether Venezuela is entitled to other territory not hitherto in dispute. This is no exaggerated statement of the case, as may be seen by reference in the official correspondence soon to be made public.

To sum up, previous to the year 1840 England had not extended her occupancy beyond the Morocco River, nor intimated a purpose to extend her claim beyond that stream. Suddenly, in the latter part of that year, she made an attempt to extend her claim and occupancy to the Orinoco Delta and the Amacura and Cuyuni Rivers. In 1842 she receded from this position, ordered the "Schomburgk line" obliterated, and proposed "the Aberdeen line," beginning near the mouth of the Morocco. In 1851 she again changed the limits of her claim by what is known as "the Granville line." In 1855 she entered into a written agreement to refer the whole question of boundary to arbitration; but just two months and twelve days afterward, under a change of Ministry, she repudiated that agreement. In 1856 she again shifted position and proposed what is known as "the first Rosebery line," beginning on the coast near the mouth of the Guiana River. In 1857 she occupied all the territory within the old "Schomburgk line," which she had previously disclaimed. In 1859 she shifted position again and proposed "the Salisbury line"—thus claiming the lower Orinoco. In 1863, still advancing into that had never before been disputed as Venezuelan territory, she proposed a boundary line running from a point on the Orinoco so as to include the headwaters of the Cumano and the Sierras of Usupamp. Finally, in 1864, when again requested to sub-

mit her claim to friendly arbitration, she replied there was nothing to arbitrate within the compass of her *de facto* possessions!

In its present phase, the question at issue can hardly be said to be one of boundary, since the claim put forth by Great Britain does not follow historical traditions or evidence, but is apparently indefinite. It is rather a question of conquest, pure and simple, and therefore clearly in contravention to modern international usage and in open defiance of the Monroe Doctrine. Whether that doctrine is or is not a part of the modern system of international law is immaterial. It is part of the settled policy of the United States. Whether the President's interpretation of that doctrine in the present case can be found in the phraseology of the declaration of 1823, does not matter. His interpretation is a logical deduction from the manifest spirit and purpose of that declaration. The United States having regard to its own honor and safety, cannot permit the forcible extension of European colonies on the continent. It is time to call a halt to the process of dismemberment of an American republic, and menace of the two others adjacent; and every true American citizen, regardless of partisan affiliations and differences, will rally to the support of the Government in the effort to maintain its plighted faith and preserve its honor and prestige.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND JINGOISM.

BY PROF. COURTENAY DE KALB,
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

If doubts had existed previously in the mind of any person whether or no the Monroe Doctrine were a principle still active in American political life, the events of the third week in December, 1895, must have dispelled them utterly. Protests are still heard in certain quarters that a misconstruction or a misapplication has been made of the historic doctrine laid down by Monroe; but in the face of this stands the great fact, which no man can fail to see, that it has been applied with firmness, in accordance with its traditional significance, to the Venezuelan question. It is easy to quibble over words, to narrow the meaning of Monroe's utterances, to explain that they were the outgrowth of peculiar and transient conditions; it is equally easy to show that the original words of Monroe's Message required construction to fit the special cases to which they were applied by Polk in 1845 in the dispute with Great Britain over the Oregon territory, and again in 1848 in the question of a supposed transfer of Yucatan to England, and once more by Seward, in 1860, when the French were seeking to establish a monarchy in Mexico. These, however, cannot be considered as expansions of the Monroe Doctrine, as many would have us believe. The principle itself is broad, and each application to a particular case is necessarily a limitation of it, an inevitable result of ceasing for the moment to regard it as an abstract generality, and considering it in its relations to a concrete particular case. The utterance of Monroe was with special reference to the designs of the Holy Alliance against the newly constituted Spanish American republics. It was founded upon belief in the existence of a principle of justice which should defend the Spanish-Americans in their blood-bought liberties against the power of European Governments, and in a conviction of duty to our own country, whose security would be menaced by the growth of European domination on the American continents. The merit of the utterance did not rest upon the warrant of right revealed in the position taken by Monroe with reference to this special set of circumstances, but in its recognition of a principle and a duty, existing before these special circumstances in themselves became dangerous, which were broad enough to stand as a national doctrine for general application.

It is peculiarly fortunate that a principle so vitally affecting our political safety and permanence should not have been reduced to the form of written statement promulgated as such by legislative act. Crystallization means fixedness, limitation. The principle enunciated by Monroe might be involved in such an act, but the act could not by any possibility include the broad principle. It needs but little logic to show that the part cannot contain the whole. It is the best evidence that could be given of the absence of what is called "jingoism" as a controlling or even prominent factor in our political development, that this great doctrine, which has for so many decades been cherished by the American people, should have failed to undergo the restrictions of crystallization in a formal resolution of Congress. More than this, when presented in this form to Congress in the days of President John Quincy Adams, it failed of passage for the very reason that it would thus become a restriction upon our future freedom of action. Jingoism would not have succeeded to change a living principle into the dry-bone of law for the sake of fleeting popularity; and yet again and again has Congress by its acts sustained the application of this unwritten law in our foreign relations, and it has unanimously sustained President Cleveland in asking for means to carry it into effect in the present crisis.

There are two distinct references to the doctrine of non-interference in Monroe's famous message of December 2d, 1823. The first is:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

While this was laid down as a general principle, it was in this case applied directly to threatened attempts at further colonization enterprises on the northwest coast of North America. At the same time it sounds the keynote for the whole message, which later on declares:

"But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have,

on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

It is evident that the spirit of wise forecast which distinguishes the characters of those illustrious men who founded the Republic and carried it in safety through the perils of infancy, was strong in the mind of Monroe when he penned those words, and that he realized that he was outlining a policy which should endure for generations. Hence was he explicit in lifting the disensure above the concerns of the moment and announcing a general principle.

From our present knowledge of the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute, the evidence points overwhelmingly toward aggressions, on the part of England, upon territory which in the past she herself distinctly recognized as Venezuelan. If her attempt to hold this territory without award from a court of arbitration is not an act of "oppression," the meaning of English words must be obscure indeed. President Cleveland, however, meets the objection against applying the Monroe Doctrine in this case by reference to Monroe's general discussion of his principle, wherein he pronounces against an extension of the European governmental systems in America; and President Cleveland very justly sets aside any possible quibbling over this or over the meaning of "colonization," in his assertion that "it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise."

This statement would seem to have been made in the knowledge of many things that have not very generally appeared in print. In the first place, England now lays claim to the whole watershed of the river Essequibo, on the principle that an entire watershed constitutes a natural territorial division. At the same time England claims a frontage on the river Orinoco, and the assertion has frequently been made in Great Britain that she should control all the territory east of this river. Furthermore, a party of English engineers has recently, without license from Brazil, been engaged upon a reconnaissance for a railroad line southward from British Guiana toward the Amazon. This territory is to-day unoccupied, and the most that is known concerning it has been derived from the work of British explorers. It is a region of broad, open savannas and rolling, wooded country, well adapted for European colonization. It leads also into the heart of the rubber country of the Amazon, which means that the nation which holds it could control a commerce which to-day amounts to about \$40,000,000 per annum. British capital is already largely involved in this commerce. An English company is operating a line of forty-five steamboats on the Amazon, and another English company is at the present moment laying a cable from Pará to Marabos at the junction of the rivers Amazon and Negro, the point to which this region of savannas and highlands extend from the north. The conclusion seems strong that if the acquisition of territory on the part of Great Britain by extensions of boundaries should not be checked, we would ultimately see her in possession of the Orinoco and the heart of the Amazonian basin; and it may not be generally known that she could set up claims to portions of the lower Amazonian basin itself on the strength of priority of settlement, since the efforts of the Portuguese to occupy the lower part of the main stream of the Amazon were first made on account of the establishment of a British town and fort on the island of Gurupá. England takes a long look ahead in laying out her schemes of aggression. Her machinations for the control of the Mosquito Coast began in 1688, and continued until she secured a protectorate in 1823. Where once she has planted her foot she regards the soil ever after as pertaining to her crown; and so, the dispossessed of the Bay Islands of Honduras by the United States, and having formally ceded them to Honduras, her latest official utterance on this subject has been that the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty would be regarded by her as reviving her right to them.

These are but indices of that policy persistently pursued by Great Britain which renders what seems to be an attempt to enlarge her territory at the expense of Venezuela, one of those actions "dangerous to our peace and safety," as contemplated by President Monroe. And yet the resistance of such an attempt is classed as jingoism by some who occupy what should be the sacred post of public instruction through the daily press. We have no term to denominate this extreme opposite of jingoism, which would have us sacrifice all to a grasping power, and sit supinely by while an enemy surrounds us east and west with bristling naval stations, and proceeds to devour our neighbor's territory in defiance of our request for the application of judicial methods to mete out justice. We have not named this opposite pole of jingoism which knows not the patriotism of the fathers of the Republic; which has disordered notions of national duty, and feels no qualms at what true patriots regard as national dishonor. But if jingoism offends the sincere patriot by its unreasoning excesses, and does injustice to our reputation for integrity and fairness of principle, it is less dangerous because it is too violent to command the respect of that vast multitude of sober and honest men whose counsels inevitably prevail in our national acts. But those who come in the guise of patriotism, and call all men jingolists who would defend the principles and safeguards of American liberty, are more to be feared, because their teachings instill a spirit of acquiescence in conditions which threaten the untrammelled growth of American institutions. They are more to be feared because they are often men of honest purposes, whose doctrines are founded in sentiments of brotherly love, and who seek to establish at once that state of universal peace which can only be attained when the whole world shall lay down its arms and covenant to submit all difficulties to friendly arbitration. This spirit is no new thing in American history. It has seemed to many that the manifest destiny of the Great Republic was to put these principles into opera-

tion throughout the world, and no fairer prospect could animate the hopes of the American people. But there are right and wrong ways of working toward this end. To honorably maintain the institutions of liberty inviolate and protect them against growing dangers is the first essential. To suffer the prospect of their continuance to be weakened is a sin against ourselves, our posterity and the world. It was with this in mind that Daniel Webster spoke,* referring to the Monroe Doctrine:

"It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame."

There are many mildew-headers at work in these days, but however honest may be their desire to establish the glory of America, the act of President Cleveland, so patriotically supported by Congress, in proclaiming that injustice shall not be done by a European power to a weaker sister on this continent, and that strict justice shall be accorded to all, though taken in the face of possible war, will hasten the millennium of peace, whereas weak concessions would only serve to expose us to contempt, and invite infringements of the liberties bought with the blood of seventy six.

ROLLA, MO.

HOW THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED IN VENEZUELA.

CHEERING THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

BY KATE FOOTE COE.

THE special message of President Cleveland to Congress upon the difficulties between Venezuela and England, set the Venezuelan heart on fire. The news came by telegram from New York, and was caught up at once and a meeting arranged for that evening with a swiftness that astonishes one who has seen anything of Spanish ways. The afternoon papers published a notice of a meeting to be held that evening at the Plaza Washington; and, lest every one should not hear of it, printed strips were carried about the streets by boys who threw them into the carriages of people driving and into the doors and windows of those at home.

Caracas has many public squares, all pretty, with trees and statues, and one with the statue of Washington in its center named Plaza Washington. Things began here. They decorated the statue with flowers, and, as the square filled with people and more room became necessary, they adjourned to the Plaza Bolivar, where we first saw the crowd massed around the equestrian bronze of the Liberator, the flags of the United States and of Venezuela waving on each side, the whole lighted like day with electric lamps, and the clear, cool air of a Venezuelan winter invigorating all hearts. They sent up rockets, the hand played the "Star Spangled Banner," and we, a group of half a dozen American gentlemen with two ladies, looked on and felt the pleasure of seeing our own flag honored in a foreign land. We caught Spanish words of high sound as they called upon one speaker after another, who roused them, and to whom they gave cheers that soared up among the mahogany trees that border the square, and made me feel that if the words were Spanish the sounds were very like those we have heard in the United States.

This for a while, until the great square was packed; then the hand, the flags and the people set themselves toward the house of General Thomas. He had received some notice of the manifestation, but had not made much preparation, for no one imagined the crowd would be as great as it was. The house, not very large, is built in the Spanish style, a court in the center and rooms opening around the three sides. It was packed to its utmost limits with the people of Venezuela, in a close, orderly mass, who, as Mrs. Thomas kindly said afterward, did just as little damage as a crowd could. But they were there, and they meant to hear and see. It was no use trying to receive them American fashion. There were all stood with General Thomas, a fine figure and handsome head, in the center of the parlor, with his wife near; and after many cries, "*Silencio, silencio*," had produced their effect, Mr. Beures, who is the son of the Venezuelan Minister to Washington, mounted on a chair, read a very excellent little speech in good, clear English. It was a pleasure to hear him, because he appreciated the situation of the two countries so fully. "*La Gran Republica del Norte*," which had fought its liberty with a struggle in years past, proud and prosperous now, was yet magnanimous enough to look with friendly eyes upon its sister Republics. Through President Cleveland it had spoken, and they the people were there to express to the full their appreciation of this act. At every mention of Mr. Cleveland's name, the air was filled with cheers, pleasing to ears that were of a different party from the President, because we were Americans. General Thomas is a ready speaker and made an admirable reply, offhand, thoughtful and cautious, in the best way, as one who appreciated the position fully. We were all listening keenly, for it was the first time we had heard him speak, and we knew how he must not commit to the air a breath more than just the sympathy of our Government and our desire to do something for Venezuela. He did this well, and then spoke of the beauty of the country, its perennial flora and its opportunities to make itself a place among the nations of this continent. It was received as well as it was put by those in the rooms, many of whom evidently understood English, and again there were hearty cheers for *Señor Minister de los Estados Unidos*.

The street, meantime, was packed outside for a block above and below the house with a crowd which could not get in. When the address was finished General Thomas was called to the window to receive the shouts of the multitude and to observe the numbers; also to see the rockets that were being sent up and the red fire that they were burning to illuminate the scene. Finally he went to the outside door to let them see that he was fully comprehend-

* Speech on the Panama Congress, April, 1826.

ing their outbursts. One of our group of five Americans had gracefully called "Vivas for Venezuela," in response to the cheers for Mr. Cleveland. The act was received as it was meant, and the curtains swayed at the windows with the hand claps and cheers. We had all of us been pleased at the recognition awarded our party while we were among the people outside, and again when we attempted to enter the crowded courtyard. Passes "por las Señoras," the word was passed along, and acted like magic. How the packed numbers managed to efface themselves to give us way we could not imagine, and we found ourselves bowing and saying "Gracias," "Gracias," as if we were the favorites of fortune in being "Americans." It must be remembered that the demonstration was of the people—they were of all sorts; and the gentlemen whom Mr. Thomas had designated as assistants on the occasion were unable to get within a hock of the house. It was so much more an outpouring of numbers than had been expected that they were simply swamped and had to stay hocked in until after the most was over. Later they were able to get in, but it was after the especial interest of the thing was over. The multitude, after it had finished its rockets and red fire, floated back again to the Plaza Bolívar, and there heard more speeches, and for an hour or two kept up an enthusiasm that astonished us cooler heads. It was eleven o'clock before they dispersed. Yet it had been an orderly manifestation from first to last; polite, eager, warm, but not drunken or rowdy.

We called at the legation the next day to renew our congratulations, and it was then that Mrs. Thomas said that nothing had been hurt but her plants in the courtyard, and those, of course, "had to take it; but," said she, "everything grows so fast in this climate, that they will soon make good the difference." It was then ten o'clock in the morning, and so well had the gardener done his work, that the little courtyard bed was already full of fresh plants, and the parlors looked dainty, and the little matters of ornament on the table as untouched as possible.

The enthusiasm lasted to an astonishing length of time. The next day we heard firecrackers popping in various directions, and innocently supposed it to be hoys beginning festivities for Christmas, but we were soon disabused of the idea. Go down and see the flowers now on the Plaza Washington, said one. We went, and lo, there were not only more replacing those that might be faded, but they were more beautiful and more elaborate; roses, jasmínee, and, above all, tuberoses in broad wreaths, made the air sweet. The bronze figure above extended a benignant hand over a display that made us think of Decoration Day at home. Then we went back to the Plaza Bolívar, where the flags still stood, ours and the Venezuelan on each side of the Bolívar statue, and lo, the great square was again half full, and somebody was making a speech from the pedestal of the figure! It was daylight, and I could see distinctly the faces and the behavior of the people. They were attentive, they were quiet, and they stayed to hear. I could not understand much that was said, so I watched the faces and took the spirit of the meeting from their expressions. I think we had all felt that the manifestations would have much of swagger about them, that they could do what they pleased now, for, with the United States behind them, they need not be responsible. But there was nothing of this feeling in the air.

The British Consul did not go to the meeting in the plaza or at the Minister's, but he was unmolested in every way. In France they might have pulled down his national coat of arms over the door, but here it was not even thought of. They have not had a British Minister here in many years, because the hard feeling between the two countries is of long standing, and is deep as well as hard, but the consul who is the substitute in a measure has had no trouble. The morning after the meeting there was a short paragraph in one of the papers saying that as he was of Venezuelan blood—his mother is Spanish and his father English—it would be a pleasant sight for Venezuelans to see him espousing their cause, and that they should appreciate such an act highly. But that was all. They did not speak harshly; they did not abuse him as we do in the United States, and they have not tried to influence him by affecting his other business here. Altogether the conduct of Venezuela thus far has been admirable. If Congress will kindly attend to the President's Message, appoint the Commission and make the appropriation necessary for its expenses, it is all that this Republic will ask for some time.

We went into the National Library the other day; that is, we wandered in by accident. The courtyards of the houses, when their doors open at the end of the passage, offer such fascinating glimpses of interiors, with palms and ferns and other loveliness in green, that one acquires the habit of "staring in" as one goes along the street. So as we went by the doors of this building we looked in, and the open court had tables set about on its pavement, and men were sitting there reading. At the street door stood a young gentleman who invited us in with a graceful gesture and a word or two of Spanish. We went in, and, using a little mangled Spanish with a dash or two of Italian and a word of English, making a "plapamento," or pigeon Spanish of our own, we learned that it was the National Library, and that they had very valuable old Spanish books. Then we saw those wonderful old books, dating back to the time of the Spanish Conquest, upon ecclesiastical jurisprudence, and one written by an Inca of Peru, who had learned the language of his conquerors. Then the young gentleman showed us the English part of his library, and laid his hand on a volume of Byron's poems, with a look as if we Americans would appreciate the love for liberty, the expression of which is the best part of Byron's work, great genius as he was. Then he could not restrain himself any longer, but expressed his pleasure at the recent news from North America—"las doctrinas elevadas y nobles de Monroe." Then, as we came away, he gave us "Good evening" in such irreproachable English, so evidently his best expression, and called up on purpose for us, that we went away very much impressed.

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.

WHY AMERICANS DISLIKE ENGLAND.

BY GEORGE BURTON ADAMS,
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN YALE COLLEGE.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S message on the Venezuela question has made evident to ourselves and to England the widespread popular dislike, not to say hatred, of that country which exists in this. It has made it so evident that no one can any longer question its existence. Future historians will be interested to account for this feeling, which may seem to them strange and unnatural; but it is not difficult for us to understand the reasons for it.

For more than a hundred years we have been trained, by an uninterrupted series of events, to dislike the mother country. We may say that this feeling begins with the War of the Revolution, the way was prepared for that event by a sense of injustice which had long been growing. The feeling which that war left was deepened by the retention of the Western posts, and by the belief, whether right or wrong, that England was plotting to turn loose upon our frontier settlers the horrors of Indian warfare. We may now celebrate the conclusion of Jay's Treaty; but the conditions of that treaty excited a very bitter feeling in 1795. It was but a short time from this to the hostility which was created by the English use of the right of search and by the impressment of American seamen, followed by the War of 1812. England experienced the evil results of her misuse of the right of search when she began her earnest efforts to suppress the slave trade, and, however much Americans may have sympathized with her purpose, their dislike of England was not lessened by her efforts to carry it out. The various boundary disputes in the middle of the century served to keep the feeling alive, and if the "naked beans war" was ridiculous, there was some spirit behind it, and the excitement of the "fifty-four forty, or fight" period was, in some respects, like that of today.

But far more effective in creating the present feeling than all these earlier incidents together is the attitude of England during our Civil War. Thousands of men who can forgive everything else cannot forgive that. The feeling toward the rebels has practically disappeared, even that toward the "copperheads" has ceased to show itself; but one can hear on every hand still, and from the best of men, expression of the old feeling in regard to England; and many, who felt it strongly at the time, hold it almost or quite as strongly now. To this must be added, as an active present influence, our feeling in regard to Ireland. I leave entirely out of this account the illegitimate influence of the large Irish vote upon politicians who do not care for the results of their words or acts if they can gain a present success. There is a large and legitimate influence of the Irish question upon the general current of our feeling in regard to England. This is partly due to the almost universal belief in this country that Ireland has been very unjustly treated by England, and is so still; for Americans find it very hard to understand the English fear of Home Rule. No other single case has had anything like so much to do with creating the general opinion among us that England is the oppressor of feeble races, as her conduct in Ireland. It is also partly due to the share which numerous Irishmen and men of Irish descent, who have risen to great and deserved influence in hundreds of communities throughout the country, have had in shaping public opinion. Since the Civil War, again, the teaching of the protectionists has had, beyond all doubt, a very decided influence in this same direction. This fact is entirely independent of the question whether the protectionist doctrine is right or wrong. Orators and newspapers have labored to teach the people that England is the deadly foe of our industries, seeking by every means, open and secret, to destroy them, and with no slight effect. Any one, who has not taken the pains to examine the fact, would be greatly surprised at the number of persons, who would be very angry if they were called ignorant, who nevertheless implicitly believe in the donations of gold by the Cobden Club to aid in the war upon American manufactures.

Finally, there must be added the general feeling that England's colonial policy is a thoroughly selfish one, that she is trying to annex everything for which she can advance a plausible pretext, or, in a somewhat literal sense of the slang phrase, that she "wants the earth," and that she will stick at nothing in her efforts to get it. This feeling has probably more to do than all else with sustaining in the popular judgment the policy which passes to day as the Monroe Doctrine, and it largely explains why we seem to have one doctrine for England and another for other nations. There is a fixed determination in the will of the people of this country that on the American continent this policy of England's shall find no field for its exercise. It may be a blind and somewhat unreasoning determination in its application to special cases, but it is not without its justification.

Here is a hundred years of training all in the same general line, and the upshot of all this history is that there is a very widespread feeling of dislike and suspicion of England in this country, that this is in fact the prevailing feeling among the masses, and England must take the fact into account in her reckonings. If she counts upon a sense of race relationship and kinship, a kind of mother-and-daughter feeling, she is counting upon something which exists in thousands of individual cases, but which does not exist as a general public feeling, and which would have scarcely an appreciable influence in determining our action in times of great excitement.

The attempt has been made here to show that the common feeling in this country toward England has a more or less legitimate and reasonable foundation in our past history, but it is hardly possible that any one, who can think clearly and who will look out calmly upon the probable future of the world, can avoid the belief that it is in the main a really mistaken feeling, and that it is in every regard to be deplored. Some of the consequences to which it might easily lead us are horrible to contemplate. Here are two of them which have recently been discussed as cer-

tainities in case of a war with England. The first is the adoption, as our chief reliance in such a war, of a means of injuring enemies which nearly all civilized nations agreed, forty years ago, to abandon as too barbarous for longer use—that is privateering, or legalized piracy. The second is an alliance with Russia in a common war upon the British Empire. This means an alliance with the one most dangerous power which represents everything, and which is most zealously engaged in spreading, everything in government and civilization to which we are most opposed—an alliance to make war upon the power which is most actively engaged in every quarter of the globe in advancing the ideas in which we ourselves most thoroughly believe.

For we ought to remember that England stands for the same things throughout the world for which we stand. Her faults are great and not to be denied; but we should not forget that they are our faults as well. She is arrogant and overbearing; but we have not to go so very far back in our history to find the same traits displayed in our own public utterances. She has borne hard upon barbarous races under her rule; but what have we to say of our own Indian policy? She browbeats weaker nations and is greedy of land; but with the crime of the Mexican War to our account, we have not many stones to throw at England. These very faults carry with them the proof of our kinship, and, when all is said, England stands for far more of the things that we believe to be of the highest good for men, for far more of the things on which we pride ourselves, than does any other nation in the world. If we wish to make these things prevail in the world and to give men liberty and justice and the power to rule themselves, our place is on the side of England. If we wish to do our best to help despotism to prevail and to turn men back from the goal which they are even now nearing to struggle through another eighteenth century of darkness and revolutions to come up to it again, then we ought to be on the side of Russia to help her destroy the British Empire.

Fine Arts.

THE FALL ACADEMY.

BY SOPHIA ANTOINETTE WALKER.

The Autumn Exhibition has always been inferior in interest to the Annual Exhibition of the National Academy, held each spring. But this year it is so very meager, so lacking in contributions from the best men, and in the better work of the new men, that one wonders why it exists at all. Why not do away with an exhibition affording a means so little prized by artists for showing their work? There are about ninety academicians, and, with few exceptions, the strong men take no part in this Fall Academy. Messrs. Blashfield, Blum, Chase, Dewing, Flagg, Homer, Eastman Johnston, La Farge, Low, Maynard, Millet, Mowbray, Shirlaw, St. Gaudens, Tiffany, Tryon, Vedder, Horatio Walker and J. Alden Weir are among the academicians who have sent not even a single canvas, and to these absentees must be added associate members, including Mes Beaux and Messrs. Brush, Sargent, H. O. Walker and Irving Wiles. The truth is, there are now so many exhibitions of greater importance, that this venerable Fall Academy holds, among them all, an inconspicuous position which is fast becoming contemptible. There are now a number of exhibitions in other cities where great prizes are to be won, and where, in the contest, strong men meet in helpful rivalry. The Philadelphia Academy opened the same day as the National Academy, and offers prizes amounting to seven thousand two hundred dollars besides the Gold Medal. The Fall Academy has nothing in that line to offer; it is dependent upon the disinterested efforts and contributions of the older good painters to keep up public interest in an exhibition which otherwise will consist only of the work of academicians whose canvases are not acceptable elsewhere, and of young artists who are happy to see their maiden efforts hung anywhere. Indeed, it has practically already fallen to that point, and it is a serious question whether anything can and will be done about it. As soon as the public finds out that this is its character, will the door receipts justify keeping up the exhibition as a practice field for the novice?

Naturally, a few good paintings shine forth like "a good deed in a naughty world." And first, with genuine enthusiasm may be mentioned, the "Child in White," by Mrs. Prellwitz. Her steady advance toward the realization of a high artistic ideal gives promise for a greater career than that of almost any one whom I now recall. As an idealist she has been feeling her way in graceful imaginative compositions of rarer charm, if of lower technical accomplishments, than has been displayed by the brilliant realists for whom portraiture is the natural and distinctive field. But now she meets them on their own ground and, by this portrait of a delicate little flower of a child with dark, shining eyes and sensitive mouth, she recalls vividly that most beautiful of all child-portraits, the "Beatrice," by Mr. Sargent, and the charming sketch of Mrs. Sherwood's little girl by Miss Beaux. There is that same insensible blending of the carnation of the lip with the ivory flesh tone which came in long succession from Velasquez to Mr. Sargent and which Miss Beaux translated into a vernacular which Mrs. Prellwitz, happily, is not alone in making her own, so contagious is good art.

In pure technical accomplishment a "Portrait," by Frank Fowler, is even more skillful than the "Child," unless it be that the mouth is a little larger. The eyes and the lilac-tinged white gown with lilac ribbons, the whole scheme of color, and of line as well (unless the lady's black hat might have been a little broader), bear the test of long appreciative study. An earnest bit of work by Mr. H. F. Waltman, hangs near by, a small portrait of Lady Magnusson, of Iceland, who has come here to obtain means to found a school in her impoverished country by the sale

of her personal collection of Icelandic silver. A portrait of a young woman by Mr. Ryder, is primarily notable for keen character analysis and errs, if at all, by leaving too little of the personality to be discovered on further acquaintance. And "Emily Thallon," by Miss Bunker, is a true portrait with good character.

Mr. Bell, a master of tone, exhibits a small ideal head. There is a subtle, floating quality about his way of handling color quite opposed to the vigorous brush work of the Sargent school, but quite as charming; the one deriving as distinctly from Rembrandt as the other from Velasquez. The floating quality appears to go a bit too far in the bridge of the nose, which might perhaps have firmer anchorage. Mr. Hamilton is a tonalist and idealist after the manner of the absent Mr. Davies, and his "Girl in Blue" and "The Accompaniment" are two lovable little canvases in a collection conspicuously devoid of the ideal.

Of the kind of genre which will be historical a hundred years hence, so real, so beautifully clothed and surrounded has been made his three society girls, is the canvas called "Exchanging Secrets," by Mr. C. Y. Turner. It does not condescend to be pretty, like the "Neighbors," and the daintily painted and framed "Tamborine Girl," by Mr. F. C. Jones; but, altho on a small scale, it is strong and true and beautiful. Any one who remembers the "Exchanging Confidences," painted by Mr. Jones when he first came from Paris, must regret the preciosity which environs him now. And is "The Dey of Algiers" by the strong and scholarly Bridgman? He must have been trying to paint down to the level of the Fall Academy!

"Preparing for To-Morrow," by Mr. Guy, a little girl studying by lamplight, a valuable and truthful work, is among the very best things by the older Academicians, and "It Might Have Been," by Mr. Morgan, does not represent them unworthily; but for contrast one may look at modern French scholastic work in the *Salon* picture by Mr. Reeves "Going to School, Brittany," and "A Morning Frolic" of grandmother and baby, by Mr. Bredin; and for modern impressionistic work to "The Gardener's Wife," by Mr. Beckwith, a superb piece of positive force and knowledge. He may well exult in the mastery which has placed this life-size head so solidly against the background of purple and pink asters, each one painted as if it were the only thing in the canvas, yet keeping relation with all the rest.

"The Tea Hour" is a large still life with a figure added by Mr. Whitmore, whose "Cornish Village at Night," an equally well studied work, leads to landscape. Three large canvases by the late George Fness not only help cover the scantily furnished walls, but call to renewed remembrance the great power of that distinguished artist. But what is the significance of his work in an annual exhibition of current art, unless as a protest of the old school, in a majority on the jury, against the new?

"Among the Hills" is the fine, large, sunny autumn canvas which received the Gold Medal of the Philadelphia Art Club in '94, by Mr. Ochtman. Both he and Mr. C. W. Eaton seem recovering from threatened enema, and the "Red Oak," "Winter Landscape" and "Close of an October Day" show the increasing strength of the latter. "Winter," by Mr. Bruce Crane, is a cold stretch of snowy hillside against a gray bank of low-lying cloud broken by two sharp bits of yellow lining showing through. Mr. Carleton Wiggins's "Snow and Sheep," the well known snow scenes by Mr. Walter Palmer, and the "Rain and Snow, Canal Street, New York," by Mr. Van Laer, are the other principal exponents of the winter time. "Harvesting on the Hillside," by Mr. Clark, "Indian Summer," by Mr. Wiegand, "Across the Dunes," by Mr. Desjar, and "Late Autumn," by Mr. Insley, "Meadow Pools," a decorative study by Mr. Denman, "Across the River," by Mr. Roswell Hill, and the "Cathedral at Chartres" (pasted), by Miss Bradshaw, are worthy of attention, as well as the more ambitious "Chestnut Trees," by Mr. Wiley.

"A Sunny Corner," by Mr. Field, has many good qualities; but sunlight, for which they are all striving, is not among them. That is well attained by Mr. Van Gordes, in "Evening in the Village," which is, with the work of Mr. Ochtman, Mr. Eaton and Mr. Crane, among the strong canvases of the collection. Miss Matilda Browne has sent a study of a pair of oxen, in "Sun and Shade," showing progress over previous work in the successful baulding of a more difficult subject. The study could have been carried further to advantage, making the head of the off ox more solid, and carrying back the somewhat obtrusive ricks. Mr. W. H. Howe is a thoroughly accomplished cattle painter, and his "September Evening, Westchester," is a scholarly composition, in which every color and line tell for the unity of the picture. Mr. McIlhenny has painted with full, vigorous brush a group of three cattle "On the Upland."

"Autumn Fruit," by Miss Hart, is harmonious in color, and Mr. J. F. Weir proves by his "Peonies" what we know so well but apply so little, that only a master ought to paint flowers.

NEW YORK CITY.

Science.

THE Dinosaurs constitute a very interesting group of extinct reptiles. The first attempt at their classification was made as far back as 1830, and the present name was that suggested by Richard Owen in 1839. Prof. O. C. Marsh has recently proposed an amended classification for them, subject to further improvements. His paper was read before the International Congress of Zoologists at Leyden in September, and published in the December number of the *American Journal of Science*. Among the distinctive features of the Dinosaurs are the presence of separate pre-maxillary bones; the absence of teeth on the palate and clavicles; and the hind limbs are commonly larger than those in front and often the only ones used for locomotion. The sub-class is divided into three orders;

first, the *Tberopoda*, beast-footed and carnivorous; second, *Sauropoda*, lizard-footed and herbivorous; third, *Predentata*, those having extra bones in front of the usual jaws for teeth, and herbivorous. Among the beast-footed creatures is the long known *Megalosaurus*; the *Anchisaurus*, including those found in the Trias of Connecticut and supposed to have made the so-called bird tracks; the *Ceratosaurus* with small horns on the snout, and the *Hallopus*, delicate creatures with feet formed for leaping. Among the *Sauropoda* are the *Atlantosaurus* of Colorado, embracing the largest known land animals; creatures over one hundred feet in length. The *Predentates* were the most singular of all. First among them were the *Stegosaurus*, with a very formidable plated armor. The typical form had a row of immense triangular plates arranged in a line from the head to the tail, and several powerful spines at the end with which it might attack his enemies. Next were the *Ceratopsidae* with immense bison-like horns and a smaller pair in front. Other were the long known *Iguanodon*, and *Nanosaurus*, the smallest of the sub-class. In all there seem to be sixty-seven genera, forty-two from North America against twenty-five for other parts of the world. Arranged by age, ten were Triassic, forty-two Jurassic, twenty-nine Cretaceous, fourteen were common to the Jurassic and Cretaceous. The Dinosaurs resembled *Crocodyla* somewhat in the way in which the femur joins the pelvis, and their hind limbs are very suggestive of the bird-structure, so that most naturalists now believe in the origin of the birds from this sub class.

Mr. D. G. Brinton has this to say in *Science* of Dr. Dubois's remarkable find, in Java, of the *Pithecanthropus erectus*, a creature intermediate between man and the apes:

"So many articles appeared for and against the accuracy of his statements and conclusions, that the Dutch Government sent for him to come in person, and bring all his specimens to the International Zoological Congress in Leyden, in October last. He punctually appeared, with a large number of mammalian bones from the formation in which the *Pithecanthropus* was found, and an additional tooth of the animal itself.

"The geological experts present decided that the various bones indicated the oldest pleistocene or else the youngest pliocene. The anatomists expressed themselves about the skull, teeth and femur of the alleged 'missing link.' Professor Virchow, probably the most conservative, maintained that the bones were of an ape; but an ape generically distinct from any known; and if the skull and femur belonged to the same individual, then it was an erect ape, walking like a man; but he would not acknowledge that it bridged the gap between the anthropus and the anthropoid.

"Practically the same result was reached by the eminent French anatomist, Dr. Manouvrier. He studied the originals in the possession of Dr. Dubois; and he declares there can be no doubt that in them we see the remains of a creature intermediate between man and the ape, walking erect, with a cranium like that of the gibbons, but much larger than any existing gibbon.

"The conclusion is indisputable that in the *Pithecanthropus* we have an animal higher than the highest ape, and lower than the lowest man."

School and College.

THE professors of the Austrian universities have petitioned the Government for an increase of salary, and evidently deserve it. They are discriminated against to a noteworthy degree. They are on the civil list in the sixth rank of officials; but instead of the salary of 2,800 florins (\$1,100), with which the other officials on this list begin their career, the university professor receives, to begin with, even if he has an "ordinary" or full professorship, 1,800 to 2,000 florins (\$700 to 800). The highest salary paid to this rank of State officials, viz., 36,000 florins, is never received by a university man. In their petition they state that they are the only servants of the State who have not received an advance of salary since 1873, while the social and other demands on them are constantly increasing. Thus, with the exception of medical men, and the professors who have extra income from the laboratories and the like, these professors have nothing but their salaries. It has been actually computed that of the 243 professors in the philosophical faculties in Austria only 23 have an income from lecture fees amounting to 1,000 florins a year, while 118 of these professors receive less than 100 florins from this source. Some get less than 50 florins. This is the reason why the Austrian universities can seldom hold a good man. As soon as he has made fame and name, he is called to Germany, and promptly accepts his call. Hungary treats its professors more munificently. The ordinary professor begins with a salary of 3,000 florins, and gradually advances to 4,500 florins. It is very doubtful if the petition of the professors of the Austrian universities will be favorably considered by the authorities of the State.

... In Colorado College we have an instance of a Western university that from small beginnings has grown until it promises before long to rival the older institutions of the Atlantic seaboard. The City of Colorado Springs, in which the college is situated, is at present the scene of great business activity on account of the discoveries of gold at Cripple Creek, to which it is the nearest town. Seven years ago the college was contained in one small building, and its staff of teachers and body of students were of very modest proportions. To day the college campus is occupied by a handsome library, a building devoted to lecture rooms and laboratories, a residence for men, a residence for women, besides a house for the president, all of them erected by wealthy and public-spirited benefactors, and, with the exception of the library, all the gifts of residents of the town. The departments of study at Colorado College are in good bands. The mining and mineralogical department is very fully equipped, and a new and commodious building will shortly be erected, exclusively devoted to scientific laboratories and museum. Instruction in Spanish, the mother tongue of most of the inhabitants in the State immediately to the South of

Colorado, is given to regular undergraduates and also to such occasional students as wish to acquire a knowledge of the language. The number of students in the college now exceeds that in attendance at any other university in the State, and the present accommodation for them is proving insufficient.

Personals.

Mrs. F. M. Fox, a member of the Anna Warren Bailey chapter of the Daughters of the Revolution, of Gorton, Conn., relates the following incident in connection with the famous Revolutionary heroine:

"Mother Anna Warren Bailey was a very patriotic woman at the time of the war, and when the British laid siege to New London, during the heated battle the flannel for the wadding for the guns being scarce, the officers sent soldiers to surrounding houses to procure some. One of them went to Mother Bailey's house, and found her working in the field. As the matter was urgent, and fearing the British would gain the victory, she would not delay by going back to her home, but stripped off her petticoat and handed it to the soldier, bidding him speed back to his post with it. The skirt was made of new, thick flannel, woven by herself. When it was delivered and the circumstances relating to the gift were told, it inspired the soldiers with renewed energy; but the Colonel ordered it not to be torn up, unless there was not enough without it.

"The victory was won by the Americans, and the soldiers used Mother Bailey's petticoat for a flag, hoisting it on a staff with loud rejoicings.

"Fifty years ago last month I saw Mother Bailey sitting before her door at her home, sunning herself. On her head was a white cambric cap, with a broad frill, which extended around her face. She was then very aged."

... Allen G. Thurman, who has recently died, was born in Lynchburg, Va. in 1813 and, like so many other eminent men, was the son of a minister. At an early age he went to Columbus, O., where he lived till his death. In 1851 he was elected to the Supreme Court of Ohio, having already served a term in Congress, and from 1854 to 1856 he was Chief Justice. In 1869 he entered the United States Senate, where he remained for twelve years, in his "Twenty Years in Congress" Mr. Blaine says:

"Mr. Thurman's rank in the Senate was established from the day he took his seat, and was never lowered during the period of his service. He was an admirably disciplined debater, was fair in his methods of statement, logical in his argument, honest in his conclusions. He had no tricks in discussion, no catch phrases to secure attention, but was always direct and manly. . . . His retirement from the Senate was a serious loss to his party—a loss, indeed, to the body."

In 1875 he first received votes for President in the Democratic National Convention, and in 1884 he and Mr. Bayard were the only men who contested with Mr. Cleveland for the Democratic nomination. Since he retired from the Senate he has practiced law somewhat, but in the main lived a life of ease and honor at his home in Columbus.

... The many admirers of Charles Dana Gibson's "American Girl," will be surprised to learn that he means to turn his back upon her, by giving the public a new and entirely different type of American girl. It is said that this is the result of his recent marriage, and that the artist's bride is to be the new ideal of American womanhood in subsequent book illustrations, and numbers of *Life* and *The Ladies' Home Journal*.

Charities.

THE BURNHAM INDUSTRIAL FARM.

THE proposal to change the name of the Burnham Industrial Farm, at Lake Quechey, in this State, to the Berkshire Industrial Farm has now been consummated.

The change was suggested by Mr. Burnham himself, the founder of the reformatory and for many years its President. His self-renouncing view of the matter seems to have prevailed among the Directors; and the reformatory now passes into the hands of the recently elected and vigorous President, Mr. Charles E. Pellew, as the Berkshire Industrial Farm. Mr. Pellew has a work before him to rouse his enthusiasm and to reward his devotion. We bid him godspeed, and shall wish to aid him, as we have his predecessor. Meantime we cannot forget what is due to Mr. Burnham and his noble wife in the founding and development of this noble Christian Reformatory; for if its full history were told the man and his wife would be found to make a beautiful one in the story.

The estate at Lake Quechey, of more than eight hundred as far acre as the sun shines on, with its large and commodious buildings, was Mr. Burnham's original gift and was valued at not less than \$50,000, a very generous sum for a donor whose means were by no means unlimited. Year by year for the last nine he has devoted himself with faith, patience and a Christian delight in the good he was doing to this growing work. In the midst of a busy professional life he has found time to charge himself with the responsibility and personal oversight of the institution. Often have he and his wife made their home for weeks together on the ground, while he habitually went far beyond his strength in laborious devotion to the self imposed duties of his office. His gentle, gracious, Christian spirit pervaded the institution and became an important and efficient element in its reformatory atmosphere and discipline. Modeled as it was on the Raubehaus at Hamburg, and taking several of its features from the famous French institution at La Matray, it had characteristics of its own and has pursued a system that has been wonderfully successful in the reformation of obdurate boys and their conversion into good citizens, and many of them into trustworthy Christians.

Now that Mr. Burnham has found the Presidency of the Reformatory too heavy a care for him and has been compelled to throw it aside, tho he will retain his place among the Directors, he will have his reward in the present strength of the work, the noble foundation he has laid, its promise for the future, and the good it has already done.

JOHN BULL IS ANGRY.

London Believes Lord Salisbury Will Not Recede.

A CHALLENGE TO ENGLAND.
Many Think the Message to Cleveland Clearly Means War.

All Political Parties Will Doubtless Support Lord Salisbury—Men at the Political Clubs Were First Surprised, Then Indignant—Some Newspapers Think the Message is a Menace, and Others that the President Has Not Committed Himself—The Chronicle Says the Message Cannot Obscure Our Mutual Affection—The Daily News Thinks the President is Trying to Put the Republican Party in a Hole—The Standard Says Mr. Cleveland's Position is Preposterous, and that England Declines to Humiliate Herself—We Cannot Possibly Withdraw Our Protection from British Subjects Who Have Settled Up to the Schomburgk Line—Beyond the Line We Are Quite Ready to Accept Arbitration—The Times Says it is Impossible to Disregard the Gravity of the Case.

Special Cable Despatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, Dec. 17. Just after 6 o'clock this evening the Hon. Herbert Asquith, Secretary of the Admiralty, and Lord Salisbury, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, were sitting at a table in the smoking room of the Admiralty building, and were talking over the message to Cleveland which had just been received. The message was read to them by a young man who had just returned from the United States. The message was read to them by a young man who had just returned from the United States. The message was read to them by a young man who had just returned from the United States.

colony, if not the territory of our Dutch and French neighbors. By the same rule the United States might be asked to submit their title to Alaska to the judgment of impartial umpires. Congress would indignantly reject such a demand. So will the British Government reject the present demand.

THE TELEGRAPH. The Telegraph says: "The United States have no practical concern in the controversy. The invocation of the Monroe doctrine seems, on our side of the water, to be irrelevant and absurd."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

ing which the Republics of the South were behind closed doors. They were occupied with the importance to the American people of the message which was being sent to Cleveland. The message was sent to Cleveland. The message was sent to Cleveland.

THE TELEGRAPH. The Telegraph says: "The United States have no practical concern in the controversy. The invocation of the Monroe doctrine seems, on our side of the water, to be irrelevant and absurd."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE MESSAGE. The Message says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE TELEGRAPH. The Telegraph says: "The United States have no practical concern in the controversy. The invocation of the Monroe doctrine seems, on our side of the water, to be irrelevant and absurd."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

THE STANDARD. The Standard says: "Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself. We cannot possibly withdraw our protection from British subjects who have settled up to the Schomburgk line—beyond the line we are quite ready to accept arbitration."

THE CHRONICLE. The Chronicle says: "The message to Cleveland clearly means war. The President is trying to put the Republican party in a hole. The Standard says Mr. Cleveland's position is preposterous, and that England declines to humiliate herself."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE GRAPHIC. The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland's message either with pride or pleasure."

THE TIMES. The Times says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravity of the difficulties that have arisen between the country and the United States. The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office."

WE FACE ENGLAND.

Hands Off Venezuela! Is Cleveland's Message.

IS THERE WAR IN SIGHT?

No Calamity So Bad as Supine Submission, Says the President.

The Boundary Dispute, He Recommends, Should Be Submitted to a United States Commission, and that Commission's Decision We Should Stand at All Hazards—He Warns, "I Am Fully Alive to the Responsibility Incurred and Keenly Realize All the Consequences that May Follow"—Applauds the Message in Congress and Universal Praise Outside—Secretary Olney's Powerful Presentation of the Monroe Doctrine in His Communication to Salisbury on the Venezuelan Question Last Summer—Salisbury's Vain Reply—The President's Reply—The President's Reply—The President's Reply.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The President's vigorous message, as it has been called many times to-day, written by Secretary Olney while Mr. Cleveland was absent on his duck-bunting expedition and signed by the President at one of the several conferences with the Secretary of State yesterday, was sent to both Houses of Congress to-day to accompany the correspondence between Lord Salisbury and Secretary Olney in regard to the boundary dispute between England and Venezuela.

That the aggressive and patriotic tone of the message and the able presentation of the American side of the controversy contained in Secretary Olney's note of July last, met with the general approval and endorsement of the two Houses of Congress, was plain enough. In the Senate, where the message was promptly read in open session as soon as it was found that its contents had already been published by the newspapers, the precedent of many long years was broken and the hand clapping of the Senators on both sides of the Chamber, strictly unbecomingly and in violation of the rules of the body as it undoubtedly was, met a prompt echo in the applause from the occupants of the gallery. The gravity of the President's communication was so great and it dealt with such a serious diplomatic question that the Senate was disposed at first to order the document to be read behind closed doors, but this was found to be useless as the newspapers had forestalled the reading clerk in giving its contents to the public. It was read in open session, therefore, and as soon as the applause that startled some of the more ancient Senators had died away, Vice-President Stevenson read the message and the accompanying documents to the Senate. The President's communication was so great and it dealt with such a serious diplomatic question that the Senate was disposed at first to order the document to be read behind closed doors, but this was found to be useless as the newspapers had forestalled the reading clerk in giving its contents to the public. It was read in open session, therefore, and as soon as the applause that startled some of the more ancient Senators had died away, Vice-President Stevenson read the message and the accompanying documents to the Senate.

It is not unlikely, therefore, that very soon after the reconvening of Congress in January the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will be ready to propose a plan to carry out the President's recommendations for the creation of a commission to locate definitely the Venezuelan boundary line in order to demonstrate to the world that the claim of the United States Government that England is encroaching upon territory belonging to Venezuela, and thus violating the cardinal principle of the Monroe doctrine, is sound and manouverable, and its enforcement by all possible means justifiable.

In the House of Representatives the spirit of Americanism and patriotism that was uppermost in the minds of members on both sides of the House was somewhat stifled by the action of Speaker Reed in not laying the message before that body until just before the hour of adjournment, late in the afternoon. A few of the more patriotic members of both parties, however, had a hint that it would be submitted to Congress to-day, were ready to give it a rousing reception and indulge themselves in a vigorous waving of the American flag. When, however, the President's secretary appeared at the door of the House with the message under his arm, the first political row of the session was under way, the same being over the proposition of the Republicans to authorize Speaker Reed to appoint three election committees instead of one for the purpose of hurrying through the thirty-two contested cases on the docket. Ex-Speaker Crisp, spokesman for the Democrats, opposed the Republican proposition and fought it all day, even going to the extent of attempting to filibuster when forced to permit the question to come to a vote. It was nearly 5 o'clock when the Republican programme was agreed upon, and then Speaker Reed quietly laid before the House the message that had been all day lying on his table with the seals unbroken. Speaker Reed does not belong to the wild and unscrupulous type upon the efforts of his Republican associates to stir up a vigorous American sentiment in the House, but his feeling had nothing to do with the suppressing of the message. The Committee on Rules had the floor all day, and he could do nothing but allow the question under discussion to proceed to the extent of attempting to filibuster when forced to submit finally, therefore, it had been read by all the members in the newspapers, and the keen edge of enthusiasm which its contents had been received earlier in the day had been worn off. Nevertheless there was considerable applauding, and at its close it was ordered referred to the Committee of Foreign Affairs "when appointed." Under different circumstances it is probable that the message would have been received with speeches of endorsement and that the House would have taken some step to indicate its intention to support the President enthusiastically in his attitude in the controversy. Indeed, Ex-Speaker Crisp attempted to secure recognition in order to offer a resolution appropriating \$100,000 for the expenses of the proposed Commission, but was out of a motion for adjournment by Dingler, the coming leader of the House.

Strangely enough the Republicans seem to be more enthusiastic in their expression of gratification and endorsements than the Democrats. Some of the Democratic orators have been particularly to the alleged weakness of his proposition for a Commission to settle the question of

the boundary line after having told England that it must arbitrate on the facts already known or fight.

Secretary Olney said at the conclusion of the reading of the message:

"Well, that will make Cleveland President again."

"Oh, no," said a Democratic colleague beside him. "It will not make him President, but it makes him a fourth nomination from the Democratic party and a certain candidacy for the third time."

All the Cuckoos in Congress at once took up this song and for a while they carried the prediction that no other name than that of Grover Cleveland would be seriously considered at the next Democratic National Convention.

There is, of course, no question that the President's recommendation with regard to the creation of a boundary Commission will be carried out after promptly and cheerfully, and this makes it almost certain that the final step in this diplomatic quarrel between the United States and Great Britain will be taken officially by Mr. Cleveland's successor in the Presidential office. Several months will be required for the necessary legislation, the organization of the Commission and its departure for Venezuela. Then will follow many months of weary painstaking labor in carrying out instructions of the State Department, and when the report of the Commission shall have been submitted another diplomatic correspondence will surely follow.

This probably will carry the controversy into another Administration for a continental settlement. It is in this respect, therefore, that the creation of a boundary Commission that serves to check partly the war talk in Washington to-night. Those who from the first have favored a vigorous enforcement of the Monroe doctrine and its strict enforcement with regard to the dispute between England and Venezuela are not now called in question, but supporters of the Administration's foreign policy and for the first time during his incumbency of the office of President Mr. Cleveland has outlined a policy that meets with the hearty endorsement of the great majority of all parties in Congress and the approval of the whole American people.

RECOGNIZED IN INTERNATIONAL LAW. "The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in the principles of international law, which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced."

"Of course, this Government is entirely confident that under the sanction of this doctrine we have clear rights and undoubted claims. Nor is this language of President Monroe apparently intended, as the President's Minister while not admitting that the Monroe doctrine is applicable to present conditions, states:

"In declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated, President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English Government of that date."

"The first step in the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutary, it is impossible to admit that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law."

"Again he says: 'Their Majesty's Government naturally concern with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisition on the part of the European States would be a highly inexpedient change.'

"In the belief that the doctrine which we content to resist, by the language of President Monroe, is a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory fairly included within her lines of ownership, this Government proposed to the Government of Great Britain to settle the question, to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear."

"It will be seen from the correspondence heretofore submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British Government, upon grounds which in the circumstances seem to me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply regretted that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world, and touching its relations to one comparatively weak and small, should have produced no better result."

"The course to be pursued by this Government in the present condition does not appear to admit of serious doubt. Having labored faithfully for many years to induce Great Britain to submit this dispute to impartial arbitration, and having been now finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize the present status of the territory in question, and to deal with it accordingly. Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States."

FOR A UNITED STATES COMMISSION. "Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it incumbent upon the Government to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its jurisdiction what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records, and facts in support of the claims of both parties."

"In order to make an examination should be proposed to the Government of Great Britain, I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a Commission to be appointed by the Executive, which shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay."

TO RESIST WILFUL AGGRESSION. "When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be every duty of its United States to resist by every means in its power, as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests, any further extension by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

"In making those recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred and fully realize all the consequences that may follow."

THE MESSAGE. The Message says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power."

THE TELEGRAPH. The Telegraph says: "The United States have no practical concern in the controversy. The invocation of the Monroe doctrine seems, on our side of the water, to be irrelevant and absurd."

THE DAILY NEWS. The Daily News says: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are

Great Britain is not likely to evade the challenge. It will not be treated from the plain path by threats.

The full Montezuma does not regard Mr. Cleveland's communication to Congress as a serious message, but only an election address, which ought to bring to him the solid vote of the concession mongers, who already see themselves washing out tons of gold on the Essequibo River.

The British warships now in American waters, together with their dispatches, which is followed by a list of the vessels composing the United States Navy, giving also their capacity, etc.

They May Make Us Suffer, but They Cannot Make Us Yield.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

no chief of State has dared to use toward the British Foreign Office such firm language as that of Mr. Cleveland's.

England is in a dilemma. Submission is equivalent to humiliation and resistance to a civil war, which America has at its disposal, including the Irish, whom England's iniquitous rule has exiled to the new world.

The paper concludes in the Venezuelan dispute. The Monroe doctrine, it says, cannot be considered as a mere slogan, but as a policy of high value as a law of nations.

In conclusion the paper says that notwithstanding the fact that the Monroe doctrine is a political custom, it refuses to believe that Mr. Cleveland would risk the fortune and honor of his country by a policy of submission.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

THE MONTREUX GAZETTE has an article showing the numerical strength of the United States Army, and the strength, character, and location of the country's defenses.

OUR STRENGTH ON THE SEA.

IT DOES NOT COMPARE WITH THAT OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Admiral Bunsen's fleet, however, is made up of the North Atlantic and the West Indies Squadron. The Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

LETTERS FROM VENEZUELA.

HOODAY HINT. Some one on your holiday box of our HERMONA or ALBA VIOLET Perfume.

Several Powers Are Pressing Venezuela for the Payment of Claims—Crespo Not Willing to Pay the \$500,000 Indemnity Demanded by England.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

OUR STRENGTH ON THE SEA.

IT DOES NOT COMPARE WITH THAT OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Admiral Bunsen's fleet, however, is made up of the North Atlantic and the West Indies Squadron. The Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Secretary of the Navy in New York today issued instructions to the various stations to undergo repairs for the winter.

LETTERS FROM VENEZUELA.

HOODAY HINT. Some one on your holiday box of our HERMONA or ALBA VIOLET Perfume.

Several Powers Are Pressing Venezuela for the Payment of Claims—Crespo Not Willing to Pay the \$500,000 Indemnity Demanded by England.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

LETTERS FROM VENEZUELA.

HOODAY HINT. Some one on your holiday box of our HERMONA or ALBA VIOLET Perfume.

Several Powers Are Pressing Venezuela for the Payment of Claims—Crespo Not Willing to Pay the \$500,000 Indemnity Demanded by England.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

CARACAS, Venezuela, Dec. 18.—The capital has been a scene of activity and excitement since the arrival of the British minister.

BOND SYNDICATE FORMED.

TO OFFER GOLD FOR \$300,000,000 OF 30-YEAR 4 PER CENTS.

Mr. J. P. Morgan has organized a syndicate of bond subscribers...

The form of commitment prepared by J. P. Morgan & Co. was furnished to them...

The syndicate is formed to furnish a loan of \$300,000,000...

There is no basis whatever for the report that the syndicate is formed to furnish a loan...

The syndicate is formed to furnish a loan of \$300,000,000...

The syndicate is formed to furnish a loan of \$300,000,000...

The syndicate is formed to furnish a loan of \$300,000,000...

The syndicate is formed to furnish a loan of \$300,000,000...

to-morrow for their foreign correspondents...

While Mr. Morgan has taken very few people into his confidence...

EUROPEAN VIEWS OF THE LOAN.

LONDON, Dec. 31.—The Standard says about the new American loan...

BRITISH, Dec. 31.—The United States Embassy here has received...

THE NEW POET LAUREATE.

Mr. Alfred Austin has been appointed the new poet laureate...

PHILADELPHIA'S BOURSE OPEN.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 31.—The Philadelphia Bourse...

NEW MINING EXCHANGE.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 31.—The Treasury gold reserve...

WILD SILVER SCHEMERS.

FREE COINAGE MEN RUN MAD IN THE SENATE.

No End of Amending Proposals to Be Offered by the Finance Committee...

WASHINGTON, Dec. 31.—Both Houses of Congress have adjourned until next Friday...

The House was in session only for a moment today, according to the agreement...

DESPERADO THIRASHER AT LARGE.

A Night of Murder and a Horse Crack in Birmingham, Ala.

Carlisle's "Endless Chain."

Prof. Ross of Stanford University is a Descriptive Fallacy.

Ohio's Ex-Governor Said to Have Made a Strike in Mining.

IS MORTON IN THE FIELD?

NET THE BIG FOUR AT DR. DEWEY'S HOUSE MONDAY NIGHT.

The Announcement Expected To-morrow That the Governor Is New York's First and Last Choice...

Gov. Levi P. Morton left Albany Monday afternoon and arrived in New York in time to meet the big four...

Gov. Morton visited to consult with these Republican chiefs before announcing himself as a copper-headed bona fide candidate...

THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH IS IN HER HOME.

SWEEP THE TRAIN INTO A RIVER.

A Landslide Strikes a Fast Freight-Five Men Injured.

WILLIAMSPOUNT, Pa., Dec. 31.—A big landslide occurred today and a half mile east of Georgetown on the Pennsylvania Railroad...

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1896.

THE TIMES'S GLOOMY VIEW.

England Must Be Prepared for a Vigorous Exertion of Power.

LONDON, Dec. 31. The Times says: "The new year begins with a gloomy aspect..."

THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH IS IN HER HOME.

SWEEP THE TRAIN INTO A RIVER.

A Landslide Strikes a Fast Freight-Five Men Injured.

WILLIAMSPOUNT, Pa., Dec. 31.—A big landslide occurred today and a half mile east of Georgetown on the Pennsylvania Railroad...

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1896.

ALBANY CAUCUS TICKETS.

THE REPUBLICAN MACHINE MOVED WITH BUT FEW JARNS.

Fish for Speaker and Fitzmaurice for Temporary President of the Senate Caucuses...

NO YAZZIELLA COMMISSION YET.

ANOTHER WORLD FAKE.

THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH IS IN HER HOME.

SWEEP THE TRAIN INTO A RIVER.

A Landslide Strikes a Fast Freight-Five Men Injured.

WILLIAMSPOUNT, Pa., Dec. 31.—A big landslide occurred today and a half mile east of Georgetown on the Pennsylvania Railroad...

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1896.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity:

Fair; westerly winds.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION

For New York and its Vicinity: